

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—What conditions were imposed upon him, what were the penalties that were inflicted upon him because of his not adhering to the terms of contract that information has not come to me; it is with the P.W.D. I will get it and supply to the Honourable Member if he puts a separate question.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—Why should he put a separate question ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It only means he wants notice so far as that is concerned. He may give a separate notice.

1-30 P.M.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—May I know whether Government or the concerned officers of P. W. D. imposed any fine on that contractor?

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Notice.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNPPA.—When was this contractor terminated and the new contractor was entrusted with this work?

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—The new contractor was entrusted with this work in 1960.

Sri C. K. RAJIAH SHETTY.—May I know whether the new contractor has accepted the estimated rate or is any excess rate given?

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I have no idea.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—Sir, the Minister gave reason for the delay, namely, there was delay in acquisition of land. Was it not desirable on the part of Government to acquire the land first and then entrust the work to the contractor?

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Sir, it is the business of the Municipality to acquire the land and give it to the P. W. D. to construct the water tank. It is not the fault of the department. Now, there was delay in acquisition because it took lot of time. When one objection petition is filed before the land Acquisition Officer, he has to go investigate the whole things and follow all the procedure. It is inevitable according to the law that exists today. Therefore, there was delay.

---

#### ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR VILLAGE EXTENSION OF ERRASAVADI IN CHAMARAJANAGAR TALUK.

\*Q—546. Sri B. RACHAIAH Chamaranagar).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether Uppaliga community people of Errasavadi in Chamarajanagar Taluk, have applied for the acquisition of 9½ acres of land in Survey No. 14/1, 16/1, 1/1 of the same village, for village Extension;

- (b) whether they have credited Rs. 11,000 towards the cost of the land in pursuance of direction of the acquisition officer;
- (c) when the preliminary notification was published;
- (d) the reason for the inordinate delay in issuing the final notice?

A.—Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—

- (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) 10th April 1958.
- (d) Non-deposit of the entire cost of acquisition in time.

†Sri B. RACHIAH.—May I know when the amount was deposited by them?

†Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, it was in the month of March 1960 that a sum of Rs. 5,000 was deposited. They were asked deposit the amount long back, after the issue of the Notification in 1958. There was a proposal to withdraw the acquisition proceedings. At that stage Mr. B. Rachiah filed a petition before me and I granted time. Thereafter, they deposited the amount in March 1960.

Sri B. RACHIAH.—What has happened to this file?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It is reported that the record is missing. I have passed orders to keep the concerned person under suspension and to build up fresh records.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—May I know whether the file was lost at the district level, or taluk level or subdivision level or secretariat level?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It is at the level of the Assistant Commissioner.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Since what time this file is missing?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—In the month of September 1960 the records were sent to the Deputy Commissioner. Thereafter, it was sent to the Assistant Commissioner with some observation. Since about October 1960, the file is said to be missing.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—May I know whether the land owners are trying to see that the acquisition is avoided?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I cannot say, but the matter is under investigation.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—Is the owner responsible for the missing of the file Sir?

(Laughter)

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I cannot say unless the enquiry is over.